1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 · NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

ferreting out information. Although she had had little formal schooling, her English vocabulary was very wide and her understanding of modern American culture as full as that of her own people. To only one characteristic could I take exception; none of the good humored obscenity, so characteristic of Yuman speech, was ever translated without being toned down.

I visited the Maricopa community in the winter of 1929–30 (November–March) on field funds supplied by the University of Chicago, and again in October 1931 and January 1932 on those of Yale University. My thanks for these opportunities must go to Dr. Edward Sapir and Dr. Fay-Cooper Cole. Collections were made for the Washington State Museum (University of Washington, Seattle), and for the Peabody Museum (Yale University) on which I have drawn for illustrations. During part of my stay in the field, I had the good fortune to have the companionship of Dr. A. L. Kroeber and Mr. E. W. Gifford, who drew freely on their wide acquaintance with the Yuman field for my benefit. Later they generously put in my hands their manuscripts on the ethnology of the Walapai, Southeastern Yavapai, Kamia, and Cocopa, as did Dr. Ralph Beals a summary on northern Mexico and his Cahita manuscript.

With characteristic kindness Dr. George Herzog transcribed the set of songs which I recorded on a phonograph. He has permitted me to include his remarks on the music verbatim with the metrical notation of the songs.

Edward S. Curtis has published a very brief account of the Maricopa, in which cultural borrowings from the Pima are stressed.[1] These seem inferences rather than native assertions.

The phonetic scheme used in this paper is the simpler system described in *Phonetic Transcription of Indian Languages* ("Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections," LXVI [1916], No. 6) with some use of the fuller system described there. I diverge only in using r for a strongly trilled r-sound; even more strongly trilled than Spanish rr.

LESLIE SPIER

August, 1932

[1] Curtis, Vol. II.

Kroeber E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Kohuana

211 805 not yet added the mark for the year just passed; when I saw it on February 10, it included the 1929–30 mark.

The annals as he recited them follow. I was able to get from 173 him no more than the events of the specially marked years.[3]

211 805

1838 The first Kohuana group came here [to the Gila].

1848 The Maricopa went to Yuma to fight.

1852 An old man [Bismarck] was born this year.

1857–58 The Yuma came to Sacate to fight. [This agrees with the date from Yuma, Mohave, and documentary sources.]

1859–60 The informant [Mai'nyĭ'n] was born.

1862–63 The first white man to have a store at Casa Blanca [Sweetwater] was captured by Texans. Soldiers came and fought near Tucson. [The reference is to Civil War episodes.]

1863–64 Made a peace treaty with the Yavapai.

1864–65 The Yavapai came down and stole horses; warfare started again.

1865–66 Some men here [including Kutox] were taken to Fort McDowell as scouts.

1869–70 The Maricopa left the Salt River opposite Phoenix and came here [in the Gila-Salt confluence].

[124] [3] His wife objected. After placating her, I persuaded him to let me photograph and sketch the stick, and wheedled the meanings of the specially marked years. But no persuasion would make him go counter to his wife's wishes and recount the whole systematically.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

The days were known to vary in length, but the solstices were not watched for, nor were they even named. 805 [821]

Both informants interrogated (Last Star and Kutox) stated that twelve months were counted but that there were only six names, which were repeated. The calendar month (halya', month, moon) seems to have been the lunar month. Its exact duration was unknown, apparently a matter of no concern, and I could not elicit whether it included the dark phase of the moon. Kutox stated that the moon appears twelve times a year.

The calendar was associated, not only with the seasonal appearance of plants, but with the sibs, totems, and personal names. 614 805 824 The names of the months were identical with those of sibs; the totemic plants were those gathered or planted during the month bearing the associated sib name; and the month name was said to "mean" corn and the like. Sib, month, and plant life formed a definite complex of associated ideas. Why sibs and months should bear the same names was a mystery to all informants. The association of months and plants was explained as ordained by the culture hero.

When Kukamat, the creator, died, people tried planting their seeds, but they did not know the right time. So they asked him to return. He said, "I do not know if you are strong enough to hear me." They all crowded into their one big house. When he came he spoke like thunder and they all fell asleep. All except Coyote, who tried to waken them. He told Coyote the proper time to plant and named the months so that he should know. Coyote told this to the people. [773]

The usual difficulty was encountered in attempting to get the month names and their order: "Don't remember; very long since anyone used the names." 124 805 The two informants agreed on the time the year began, the identity with sib names of at least some of the month names, and the plant-associations. The last point of agreement is important because it offers the possibility of arranging the names to agree with the seasonal round and their nearest Gregorian equivalents as follows:

February and August.....xavâtca'c
March and September.....ɣamitu'tc (doubtfully)
April and October.....ɣipa'
May and November.....l,eɯ'c
June and December.....kŭmâθi'
July and January.....mavîs or ɣamitu'tc

1:Spier E-8 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Halchidhoma

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL RELATIONS

CHIEFTAINSHIP AND MEETINGS

619 [171] National solidarity was strong among the Maricopa. This is the same sentiment recorded for other Yuman tribes of western Arizona and which sets them off so markedly from Californian peoples. The Maricopa constantly referred to themselves as a single homogeneous people, all participating equally in their group life and all united against their enemies. This despite the fact that their settlements were sprawling agglomerations of households spread over a considerable area.

[643] The solidarity expressed itself in at least three ways. There was but one chief for the whole tribe so far as is known. Men of prominence might be found in the several villages but they had no formal status as chiefs. Again, there were no internecine [628] feuds. In all the long discussions with informants, there was never so much as a hint of conflict between families or villages. And [701] further, in warfare they presented a united front against their enemies, whether in attack or defense. Minor raids took place, to [726] be sure, but what stands out in their minds are the massed battles in which a large proportion of their able-bodied men took part. This attitude of the Maricopa seems to have been duplicated among the tribes now resident with the Maricopa when in their original homes on the Colorado, although here our data are so slight as to be inconclusive. But once the remnants of these [563] tribes had been incorporated in the Maricopa community, they felt themselves completely identified with their Maricopa hosts as forming one coherent whole.

643 124 787 Both Maricopa and Halchidhoma had chiefs whose position was hereditary and functions vague. It proved difficult to get adequate information about them. Dreamers (shamans and others) were mentioned frequently and voluntarily; specific ques-

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa
Halchidhoma
Kohuana
Halyikwamai

tioning had to be directed to chieftainship with but unsatisfactory results. It would seem that others were at least equally prominent socially: shamans, song and dance leaders, the directors of funerals and mourning ceremonies, custodians of scalps, war leaders, orators, etc. All or most of them had the prestige that derived from dreaming the powers that entitled them to their positions. In a society that put a premium on dream-sanctions, it is intelligible why the chief, whose functions were of little moment, should receive slight attention.

There seems to have been but one chief at a time in each of the tribes. The difficulty is that our information relates to the period of joint community of Maricopa, Halchidhoma, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai. The groups were then impoverished in numbers and lived in mixed and scattered settlements interdigitated with Pima. There is also a question how far the chief's prestige or the office itself was due to recognition by Mexican authorities.

At the Sacate settlement when Kutox was a boy, about 1855, the Pima, Halchidhoma, and Kohuana had each their own chief. Sumll,a'm, "down-feathers travelling," was the Kohuana chief. He was entering old age at the time, and while he might have been chief when they came from the Colorado (1838–39), Kutox was uncertain.[1] At about the same time Malai', a man of like age, was chief of the Halchidhoma, then a group of perhaps twenty families. He may have been appointed by the Mexicans when they were in Mexico twenty years before. Kutox did not know whether, in an earlier period, there had been more than one Maricopa or Halchidhoma chief at a time. It seems unlikely: since he could remember the ancestry of chiefs of his day, he should have known of plural chiefs in earlier times. Last Star declared emphatically that the Maricopa had but one chief at a time.

The Maricopa tribal chief was in reality the chief of the strongest village. Other villages lacked chiefs: "they came to that place when they wanted to find out anything." Practically he was chosen by the people of his village: they simply came to him for advice and to have him address them, until he came to be recognized as chief. In native theory, however, he dreamed his position. Last Star was not certain what spirit was the subject

[1] Papago-foot, mentioned by Kroeber (*Handbook*, p. 801) on Mohave authority as Kohuana chief about 1883, was, according to Kutox, not a chief but a respected old man. Last Star thought he may have been given a trial as chief, but could not have held the position for any great time.

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15

their children are not placeable. The bastard origin of one woman can never be forgotten, since she belongs to no sib, her Indian father being unknown. I do not know how the matter came to be resolved in the case of several individuals known to be descendants of white men, but they have sib affiliation. On the other hand, all the known members of the Halchidhoma sib kwĭtk$_y$ĭl$_y$^{a} are derived from a remote Walapai ancestor. They do not know how he came to be called kwĭtk$_y$ĭ'l$_y$^{a}, but presume that the Walapai must have sibs, which is not the case.[37] They would be distinctly nonplussed if their women married men of a matrilineally organized tribe, such as the Apache or Southeastern Yavapai, but no such marriages have occurred, since these were mortal enemies. There is a recent instance, however; a marriage of a Maricopa girl to a Hopi man, now resident in nearby Phoenix. The girl's family, with whom I discussed the case, looked upon the placing of their two infants as an unsolvable problem.

Lists of sibs (cimu'l) of the several local tribes were obtained from several individuals. They were not always in agreement as to the tribal origin of particular sibs: the most probable ascription appears in the following list (Table IV). There may have been other sibs among the Halchidhoma, Kohuana, and Halyikwamai before they joined the Maricopa. But it is improbable: since the migration occurred only in the generation preceding that of my older informants, other sibs would have been remembered.

Some of the ascriptions are certain: Halchidhoma, kwĭtk$_y$ĭ'l$_y$â; Kohuana, cĭnyikwĭ's and χĭlyi'; Halyikwamai, tŏχpa's; Yuma, cŭkȧpa's; Halchidhoma and Kohuana, cĭkȧma'; Kohuana and Halyikwamai, sala'l. It was thought probable that Halchidhoma kwŭc^{a}ku' and l$_y$ȧmu'c were derived from the Kohuana. There is some doubt that the Halchidhoma originally had the sibs they share with the Maricopa, but the probability is high. Maricopa mavĭ's is extinct or may never have existed as a sib. (It is one of the month names.) My informants had never heard of anyone locally with this sib affiliation, but one man knew it as a Yuma sib. Yuma cŭkȧpa's and Pima l$_y$cω'c and χipa', given in this list, refer to individuals of immediate Yuma and Pima descent.

Some of the Maricopa and Halchidhoma sib names were the same as the six month names. This, incidentally, makes it more certain that both peoples had the same sibs, as they seem to have

[37] There is a Mohave sib kutkilya with which he may have been affiliated (Kroeber, *Handbook*, p. 742).

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

551 think of renaming objects for which the dead had been named, nor of using circumlocutions. This tabu, coupled with the freedom with which new names were coined, brought it about that there was no inheritance of particular names.

Maricopa names had thus a contradictory character. They were significant in that many of them had totemic reference and in that they were not lightly used, but they were not emotionally significant. The tabu was on the whole not emotionally rooted; it was rather a matter of etiquette, of good form. Their non-significant character is borne out by their nickname nature, the fluidity of composition, the casual way in which they were bestowed, and the readiness to change. Even the names having totemic reference are one with the avowed nicknames in that they are mere designations, just as dogs were named for convenience of reference.

124 551 614 [115] The names of all persons in the Maricopa community which follow are based on an allotment list dating from about 1915. These were obtained with difficulty from my interpreter, who invariably interrupted the procedure when a third person approached. It was striking that she knew the sib affiliation and the complicated tribal lineages even in cases where she could not recall the person's name. All the persons listed are Maricopa-speaking members of the single community despite their diversity of tribal ancestry. Probably every one of them is of mixed tribal blood, so that only in those few cases where this is not known to be the fact, could we describe them as specifically Maricopa, Halchidhoma, Kohuana, or Halyikwamai. The tribal [128] designations in the following list do not mean that the individual is reckoned an Halchidhoma, e.g., but that the patrilineal descent is from the Halchidhoma sib of that name rather than from the equivalent sib of one of the other tribes.

128 551 The names are grouped by sib and sex, so that all names of sib reference appear first (marked by an asterisk), then those referring to personal appearance and habits, other names with meaning, and those for which my interpreter knew neither meaning nor the reason for the bestowal of the name. In all cases where meaning is recorded, a satisfactory etymology was ob-

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

wildering complexity, yet it is clear that they operate with a few simple principles.

The word "system" is quite legitimately employed for this body of kinship designations. It became quite clear that the Maricopa themselves think of it as a well-defined system. Thanks to my interpreter, Mrs. Redbird, it was possible to enquire systematically into the relationship of every person in the collateral lines derived from common greatgrandparents. She needed to know no more than the sex and relative ages of the siblings from whom the lines were traced to give without hesitation the terms used between any pair in the succeeding generations to no matter what degree of remoteness. She was frankly operating with a system. Every one of the usages obtained from her was checked and cross-checked, and in nearly every instance her first response was found to be correct. Not so her mother, an old-time Maricopa of nearly sixty, who, her daughter told me, could never tell what her relatives of even slight remoteness were called. Obviously, individual interest in the subject varied widely.

It is important to note that the kinship system bears no relation whatever to the sib system; kinship groupings do not follow sib lines.

The essential principle of the system is that the relative ages of brothers and sisters are given terminological expression, and the terms for their descendants hinge on this. These distinctions appear at every point, yet the curious thing is that age distinctions between siblings have no social existence. Neither I nor my interpreter, with whom I repeatedly discussed the matter, could find any feature of social life which might give rise to this. It may exist, but Mrs. Redbird's opinion was that the terminological distinctions existed only for their own sake.

Coupled with this basic principle is the fact that half-brothers and half-sisters are considered brother and sister, but only when children of the same mother.[46] The classification of parallel cous-

[46] By implication this may also be true of the Yuma and Mohave, but not of Cocopa, Kamia, and Northern Diegueño (Gifford, *Californian Kinship Terminologies*, p. 62; Kroeber, *California Kinship Systems*, p. 341). Terms given for paternal and maternal half-siblings among Yuma and Mohave are identical with those recorded here for the Maricopa. It may therefore be that these Colorado

1:Spier E-5 (1929-1932) 1933 NT15 River Yumans NT15
Maricopa

114
124
533

The song names shown in Table VIII, also derived from Kroeber's list, were recognized so far as their possible meaning in Maricopa was concerned, but they were not known as songs to

TABLE VIII

Cue Name	Maricopa Equivalent	Meaning or Comment
———	amŏ's	mountain sheep: "too sacred an animal to describe"
awi-kunchi	kwiyu'c	meteor
chichohoichva	tcuhwĭ'tc	There was a story "called" tcuhwĭ'tc containing songs among the Maricopa, but the songs were not sung independently.
djokwar (speech)	tcŭkwe'aĭk	speech
hacha (Pleiades)	xĭtca'	Pleiades
humahnana (malodorous beetle)	xamĭsnŏ'n	malodorous beetle
ichulyuye	hasu'lg	a kind of rheumatism
ipam-imicha (person cries)	ipamĭ'tc	a person crying
halypuka (loon)	xalyapu'kc	loon
hikupk (venereal disease)	tcŏxnu'x	a bad disease (venereal?)
keruk (mourning ceremony)	kĕru'kam (Halchidhoma)	mourning ceremony (cf. Yuma karu'uk above)
nyikwar (crane)	nakwe'	crane
nyimi (wild-cat)	namĕ's	wild-cat
parhau (fox)	xataluwe'	coyote: sarâmiyo' (meaningless) was its name in myths
sampulyka (mosquito)	cămpu'llg	mosquito
yaroyara	kwiya'roya'na	This was the "name" of the songs of the old women with scalps in the tale of Coyote (p. 362).

either of my informants. It is obvious that some of the Maricopa words brought to mind by these cue names have nothing to do with the subjects of the named songs.

The following song names illicited no recognition: antelope, av'alyunu, beaver, chayautai, goose, haykwesa, hehltamataie, hortloi, kachachwar, mountain, rattlesnake (ave), wellaka.